

Specifically, in the currently outstanding non-final Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Identified the following species of the present invention that he alleges to be patentably distinct from one another:

Species I, claims 1, 2-10 and 12-20, drawn to a method of (apparatus and recording medium) correcting a predetermined adjustment value wherein the base images and correction images have a width corresponding to an integer multiple of the first interval.

Species II, claim 11, drawn to a method of (apparatus and recording medium) correcting a predetermined adjustment value wherein the base images and correction images have an interval longer than twice a short side length..

2. Required the Applicants to elect one of the foregoing species under 35 USC 121 for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted in the event that no generic claim is found to be allowable.
3. Required Applicant to list all of the pending claims that are deemed to be readable on the elected species;
4. Indicated that upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicants will be entitled to consideration of claims directed to additional species, which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all of the limitations of the allowed generic claim.
5. Reminded Applicants that any claims added to this application must specify the species to which they are directed.

6. Failed to re-acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119 (a)-(d) and (f), and to reconfirm the receipt of the required copies of the priority documents by the United States Patent and Trademark Office – **Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has appropriately comment upon these items in a previous Official Action.**
7. Failed to reconfirm the acceptability of the formal drawings filed with this application on 23 July 2003 – **Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has appropriately commented upon this item in a previous Official Action.**

No further comment regarding items 4-7 above is deemed to be required in these Remarks.

In response to the currently outstanding requirement for restriction (see items 1-3 above), **Applicant hereby elects Species I, Claims 1, 2-10 and 12-20, without traverse** for further prosecution in the merits in this application.

In the above regard, Applicants note that the present application contains claims directed to an image forming apparatus (see Claims 2-19) and to a recording medium (see Claim 20) as well as a claim directed to a method (see Claim 1). Since the species between which the Examiner has required Applicants to elect are set forth in the **apparatus claims rather than method claims,** Applicants have interpreted the Examiner's requirement as applying to all of the claims present in this application rather than only to the method Claim 1. Further in this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 2 and 20 presently are generic. Still further, Applicants believe that it was the Examiner's intent to secure Applicants' election between the species representatively specifically set forth in apparatus claims 7 and 17 on the one hand or apparatus claim 11 on the other hand including their respective base claim and any intervening claims as well as the remainder of the claims of this application including the independent method Claim 1 and the independent recording medium Claim 20.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that non-elected Claim 11 should be reinstated and considered on its substantive merits upon a determination of the allowability of its parent generic apparatus Claim 2 (that presumably will include a determination of the allowability of the corresponding method Claim 1 and recording medium Claim 20 as well as the other claims of the above-identified application).

Applicants respectfully submit that this communication is fully responsive to the currently outstanding Official Action in the above-identified application. However, in the event that Applicants have misunderstood the Examiner's intent concerning the method, apparatus and recording medium claims of this application in the course of this response to the currently outstanding restriction/election requirement issued by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully request that the currently outstanding restriction/election requirement be withdrawn and that the Examiner issue a corrected version thereof that clearly sets forth his intent concerning the method, apparatus and recording medium claims of this application.

In any event, early further substantive consideration and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Eiji Kamimura, et al  
USSN: 10/626,396  
Page 5

Applicants believe that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2007

  
**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Reg. No.:27,840

**David A. Tucker**  
*(Type or print name of practitioner)*  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP  
**P.O. Box 55874**  
P.O. Address

Customer No.: 21874

**Boston, MA 02205**

612914